

Powers, William S. (AU2134)

From: Tanya Nair [tanya.nair@silverbrookresearch.com]
Sent: Thursday, September 17, 2009 9:26 PM
To: Powers, William S. (AU2134)
Cc: Zand, Kambiz
Subject: Re: 10/727164
Attachments: 10727164US_Sept09_Email_Authorization_Letter.pdf

Dear Examiner Powers,


Thank you for your email below.

On behalf of the applicant, we authorize an Examiner's Amendment to cancel the withdrawn claims (Claims 1 and 11-14).

Attached is an email authorization letter to allow communication. Thank you for your assistance in this matter.

Kind Regards,

Tanya (On behalf of Simon Walmsley)

<!--[if !vml]-->  <!--[endif]-->
Silverbrook Research Pty Ltd

Powers, William S. (AU2134) wrote:

Ms. Nair,

I am currently processing application 10/727164 and would like to expedite the prosecution of the application. I have found the claims to be allowable over the prior art, but need authorization from the Applicants for an Examiner's Amendment to cancel the withdrawn claims (claims 1 and 11-14).

Regards,

William S. Powers
Assistant Examiner
AU 2434
571 272 8573

Powers, William S. (AU2134)

From: Tanya Nair [tanya.nair@silverbrookresearch.com]
Sent: Wednesday, September 23, 2009 6:58 PM
To: Powers, William S. (AU2134)
Cc: Zand, Kambiz
Subject: Re: 10/727164
Attachments: RMC003US_Sept09_Email_authorization_letter.pdf

Please find attached, an email authorization letter to allow communication.

Tanya Nair wrote:

Dear Examiner Powers,

Thank you for your email below.

On behalf of the Applicant, we authorize an Examiner's amendment on the above case.

Thank you for all your assistance in this matter.

Kind Regards,
Tanya

<!--[if !vml]-->  <!--[endif]-->
Silverbrook Research Pty Ltd

Powers, William S. (AU2134) wrote:

Tanya Nair,

This email message is in regards to application 10/727164. During the search of prior art the Examiner discovered that independent 2 of the instant application raises 35 USC 101 concerns. The guidelines that are used to determine compliance with the 101 statute require the tying of the claim language to a machine. In this case, it is unclear if the target entity is a machine. Claim 15 further defines the target entity as an integrated circuit. The Examiner suggests making an Examiner's Amendment that would put the independent claim 2 in compliance with current 35 US 101 guidelines with the following amendment to line 6 of the current claim 2: "sending a first message to the target entity that is a first integrated circuit..." and amend claim 15 by deleting "the target entity is a first integrated circuit and" to preserve antecedent basis. Authorization is kindly requested for the suggested amendment or the Applicant can submit an amendment that would put the instant application into compliance and enable the case to move forward in prosecution.

William S. Powers
Assistant Examiner
AU 2434